



UAA Institute of Social
and Economic Research
UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Alaska Judicial Council

Judicial Retention Survey: Peace and Probation Officers

Technical Report

Alliana Salanguit, BA, Research Professional
Trang Tran, MPP, Research Professional
Rosylind Frazier, MSPH, Senior Research Professional
Ashley Hannigan, MA, Research Professional

May 17-21, 2020

Funded by Alaska Judicial Council

<https://iseralaska.org/>

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges	2
Introduction	3
Methodology.....	3
Table 2: Respondent Characteristics	4
Instrumentation.....	5
Confidentiality and Data Safety	5
Results	5
Table 3: Level of Experience with Judges	7
Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings.....	8
Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating.....	9
Table 6: Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto: Description of Respondents' Experience	10
Table 7: Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto: Detailed Responses	10
Table 8: Judge Paul A. Roetman: Description of Respondents' Experience	11
Table 9: Judge Paul A. Roetman: Detailed Responses.....	11
Table 10: Judge Jennifer S. Henderson: Descriptions of Respondents' Experience.....	12
Table 11: Judge Jennifer S. Henderson: Detailed Responses.....	12
Table 12: Judge Gregory Miller: Description of Respondents' Experience	13
Table 13: Judge Gregory Miller: Detailed Responses.....	13
Table 14: Judge Christina Reigh: Description of Respondents' Experience	14
Table 15: Judge Christina Reigh: Detailed Responses.....	14
Table 16: Judge Jennifer K. Wells: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	15
Table 17: Judge Jennifer K. Wells: Detailed Responses.....	15
Table 18: Judge Jonathan A. Woodman: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	16
Table 19: Judge Jonathan A. Woodman: Detailed Responses	16
Table 20: Judge Leslie Dickson: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	17
Table 21: Judge Leslie Dickson: Detailed Responses.....	17
Table 22: Judge Michael Franciosi: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	18
Table 23: Judge Michael Franciosi: Detailed Responses	18
Table 24: Judge J. Patrick Hanley: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	19
Table 25: Judge J. Patrick Hanley: Detailed Responses	19
Table 26: Judge Michael Logue: Description of Respondents' Experience	20
Table 27: Judge Michael Logue: Detailed Responses.....	20
Table 28: Judge Kari L. McCrea: Description of Respondents' Experience	21
Table 29: Judge Kari L. McCrea: Detailed Responses.....	21
Table 30: Judge David R. Wallace: Description of Respondents' Experience	22
Table 31: Judge David R. Wallace: Detailed Responses	22
Table 32: Judge Pamela S. Washington: Description of Respondents' Experience	23
Table 33: Judge Pamela S. Washington: Detailed Responses.....	23
Table 34: Judge Nathaniel Peters: Description of Respondents' Experience	24
Table 35: Judge Nathaniel Peters: Detailed Responses.....	24
Table 36: Judge Matthew Christian: Description of Respondents' Experience.....	25
Table 37: Judge Matthew Christian: Detailed Responses	25
Table 38: Judge William T. Montgomery: Description of Respondents' Experience	26
Table 39: Judge William T. Montgomery: Detailed Responses.....	26

Executive Summary

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council to evaluate Alaska judges eligible to stand for retention election. This survey was conducted among Alaska peace and probation officers to obtain information about their direct professional and other relevant experience with the judges, and their assessments of judicial performance. The 2020 survey included 20 trial court judges: Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto, Judge Paul A. Roetman, Judge Dani Crosby, Judge Andrew Guidi, Judge Jennifer S. Henderson, Judge Yvonne Lamoureux, Judge Gregory Miller, Judge Christina Reigh, Judge Jennifer K. Wells, Judge Jonathan A. Woodman, Judge Leslie Dickson, Judge Michael Franciosi, Judge J. Patrick Hanley, Judge Michael Logue, Judge Kari L. McCrea, Judge David R. Wallace, Judge Pamela S. Washington, Judge Nathaniel Peters, Judge Matthew Christian, and Judge William T. Montgomery. Three of those judges, all of whom are assigned to Anchorage Superior Court civil caseloads, were rated by too few respondents for the results to be reliable; thus, the ratings for these three judges are not reported here.

The Alaska Judicial Council asked peace and probation officers to evaluate judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness*, *Integrity*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Diligence*, and *Overall*. The rating scale ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5).

Table 1 shows the mean ratings for each judge by respondents with direct professional experience on all five characteristics. Judges are listed in order by judicial district. Within each judicial district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges. Note that no judges in the First Judicial District were eligible to stand for retention in 2020.

Table 1: Mean Ratings of Judges
Mean Ratings of Judges

		Impartiality/ Fairness	Integrity	Judicial Temperament	Diligence	Overall
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	13	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.5
Judge Paul A. Roetman	14	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	21	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.9
Judge Gregory Miller	10	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2
Judge Christina Reigh	16	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	25	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	11	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5
Judge Leslie Dickson	28	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Judge Michael Franciosi	34	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	36	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Judge Michael Logue	21	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1
Judge Kari L. McCrea	10	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.1	3.8
Judge David R. Wallace	38	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Judge Pamela S. Washington	25	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7
Judge Nathaniel Peters	11	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9
Judge Matthew Christian	26	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.4
Judge William T. Montgomery	8	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.1

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judges.

2020 Judicial Retention Survey: Peace and Probation Officers

Introduction

Alaska statutes require the Alaska Judicial Council (Council) to evaluate judges standing for retention in an election year. The Council makes a recommendation to the State's voters to either retain or not retain each judge. As part of the information used to fulfill its mandate, the Council distributed surveys to Alaska peace and probation officers and asked them to rate judges on five characteristics: *Impartiality/Fairness*, *Integrity*, *Judicial Temperament*, *Diligence*, and *Overall*. Each survey also contained demographic questions about the respondents, including type of work, length of time as officer, community population, location of work, and gender.

To maintain objectivity, the Council contracted with the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER), a research workgroup at the University of Alaska Anchorage. ISER was responsible for all aspects of distribution and data collection for the survey as well as data analysis. ISER prepared this report summarizing survey procedures and results.

The 2020 retention survey for peace and probation officers included 20 trial court judges eligible for retention. The judges included: Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto, Judge Paul A. Roetman, Judge Dani Crosby, Judge Andrew Guidi, Judge Jennifer S. Henderson, Judge Yvonne Lamoureux, Judge Gregory Miller, Judge Christina Reigh, Judge Jennifer K. Wells, Judge Jonathan A. Woodman, Judge Leslie Dickson, Judge Michael Franciosi, Judge J. Patrick Hanley, Judge Michael Logue, Judge Kari L. McCrea, Judge David R. Wallace, Judge Pamela S. Washington, Judge Nathaniel Peters, Judge Matthew Christian, and Judge William T. Montgomery. However, three of these judges, all of whom are assigned to Anchorage Superior Court a civil caseload, were rated by too few respondents for the results to be reliable. Therefore, results for these three judges are not reported. For the judges included in this report, respondents' demographic information is reported in Tables 2 through 5, and not in the judges' individual tables, in order to preserve respondents' anonymity.

Methodology

Alaska peace and probation officers, including state troopers, borough and municipal police officers, airport police and fire officers, University police, public safety officers, and adult probation officers, were invited via email to participate in an online survey. Email addresses were obtained by the Judicial Council from the law enforcement agencies.

Of the 1,584 officers invited via email to participate, 345 initiated an online survey for a return rate of 21.8%. Of the 345 returned surveys, 175 did not rate any judges; 170 (49.3%) respondents evaluated one or more judges. Table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2: Respondent Characteristics
Respondent Characteristics

	All Respondents		Respondents who Rated ≥ 1 Judge	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	345	100	170	100
Type of Work				
No response	-	-	-	-
State law enforcement officer (LEO)	144	41.7	72	42.4
Municipal/Borough LEO	140	40.6	67	39.4
Village Public Safety Officer (VPSO)	4	1.2	2	1.2
Probation/parole officer	54	15.7	28	16.5
Other	3	0.9	1	0.6
Length of Time as Officer				
No response	1	0.3	1	0.6
5 years or fewer	87	25.2	33	19.4
6 to 10 years	53	15.4	26	15.3
11 to 15 years	68	19.7	38	22.4
16 to 20 years	75	21.7	39	22.9
More than 20 years	61	17.7	33	19.4
Community Population				
No response	5	1.4	1	0.6
Under 2,000	23	6.7	11	6.5
Between 2,000 and 35,000	147	42.6	60	35.3
Over 35,000	170	49.3	98	57.6
Location of Work				
No response	5	1.5	1	0.6
First District	57	16.5	1	0.6
Second District	23	6.7	17	10.0
Third District	208	60.3	111	65.3
Fourth District	52	15.1	40	23.5
Gender				
No response	1	0.3	1	0.6
Male	295	85.5	146	85.9
Female	49	14.2	23	13.5

Instrumentation

The survey contained the names of the judges eligible for retention, questions about demographic information for each respondent, five evaluation items for each judge, and space for respondents to provide additional comments regarding each judge.

Respondents evaluated judges in five areas of performance. Detailed instructions for each domain were provided:

Impartiality/Fairness: Please evaluate the judge’s sense of basic fairness and justice and whether the judge treats all parties equally.

Integrity: Please evaluate whether the judge’s conduct is free from impropriety or appearance of impropriety and whether the judge makes decisions without regard to possible public criticism.

Judicial Temperament: Please evaluate the judge’s courtesy and freedom from arrogance and whether the judge manifests human understanding and compassion.

Diligence: Please evaluate whether the judge is prepared for court proceedings, works diligently, and is reasonably prompt in making decisions.

Overall Evaluation: Please provide your overall assessment of the judge’s performance.

Respondents assigned ratings for each domain using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from *Poor* (1) to *Excellent* (5). Detailed descriptions of the meaning of each point on the Likert scale were provided:

(1) <i>Poor</i>	(2) <i>Deficient</i>	(3) <i>Acceptable</i>	(4) <i>Good</i>	(5) <i>Excellent</i>
Seldom meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Does not always meet minimum standards of performance for this court	Meets minimum standards of performance for this court	Often exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court	Consistently exceeds minimum standards of performance for this court

Confidentiality and Data Safety

The survey introduction included a statement that reassured respondents of the confidentiality of their responses. Confidentiality is also a paramount concern at ISER and translated into specific procedures related to data security. Because data such as those collected through the judicial retention survey are of a sensitive nature, ISER has rigorous procedures to protect data. Organizational policies and procedures highlight the requirement for confidentiality and ensure that only staff involved with the project have access to the data. All data are maintained on a secure server.

Each potential respondent was provided with a unique URL that could only be used once and only accessed from the e-mail address to which it was sent. Online data were downloaded from the survey website and imported into SPSS for analysis.

Results

Two sets of results are presented in this section of the report. First, respondents’ level of experience with each judge is shown. Then, a summary table presents the ratings and comparisons of the judges. Many of the cross tabulations yield results based on small numbers of respondents. Results based on small numbers of respondents should be regarded with caution and more weight given to the overall results.

In the tables, judges appear in order based on district. Within each judicial district, superior court judges appear first and are followed by district court judges. Note that no judges in the First Judicial District were eligible to stand for retention in 2020.

Respondents' Level of Experience with Each Judge

All respondents were asked to describe the basis of their evaluation for each judge they rated, with options of direct professional experience, professional reputation, and other personal contacts.

Table 3 shows the type of experience of respondents for each judge.

Ratings of Judges

In the tables that follow, responses to the rating questions are shown in a variety of ways. Most tables show the number of respondents (*n*) and the average rating (*M*). Tables 4 and 5 present details on the *Overall* item. Table 4 compares all ratings to those from respondents with direct professional experience and includes the median rating (*Mdn*) and the standard deviation (*SD*) in addition to number of respondents and average. Table 5 presents data only from those respondents who indicated direct professional experience. Table 5 provides the distribution of responses on the *Overall* item.

For each individual judge, Tables 6-39 provide information on frequency and ratings by level of experience with each judge.

Table 3: Level of Experience with Judges
Level of Experience with Judges

	<i>n</i>	% of all respondents who rated judge	Percent of Respondents Basing Ratings on...		
			Direct Professional Experience	Professional Reputation	Other Personal Contacts
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	18	5.2	72.2	16.7	11.1
Judge Paul A. Roetman	18	5.2	77.8	22.2	-
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	22	6.4	95.5	4.5	-
Judge Gregory Miller	12	3.5	83.3	16.7	-
Judge Christina Reigh	17	4.9	94.1	5.9	-
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	29	8.4	86.2	10.3	3.4
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	13	3.8	84.6	15.4	-
Judge Leslie Dickson	30	8.7	93.3	6.7	-
Judge Michael Franciosi	36	10.4	94.4	5.6	-
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	38	11.0	94.7	5.3	-
Judge Michael Logue	23	6.7	91.3	8.7	-
Judge Kari L. McCrea	12	3.5	83.3	16.7	-
Judge David R. Wallace	41	11.9	92.7	7.3	-
Judge Pamela S. Washington	30	8.7	83.3	13.3	3.3
Judge Nathaniel Peters	12	3.5	91.7	8.3	-
Judge Matthew Christian	29	8.4	89.7	6.9	3.4
Judge William T. Montgomery	9	2.6	88.9	11.1	-

Table 4: Summary of Overall Ratings
Summary of Ratings on the “Overall” Variable

	All Respondents				Respondents with Direct Professional Experience			
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	17	4.4	5.0	0.8	12	4.5	5.0	0.8
Judge Paul A. Roetman	18	4.6	5.0	0.7	14	4.7	5.0	0.6
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	21	4.8	5.0	0.6	20	4.9	5.0	0.5
Judge Gregory Miller	12	4.0	4.0	1.0	10	4.2	4.0	0.9
Judge Christina Reigh	17	3.6	4.0	1.2	16	3.8	4.0	1.2
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	29	3.6	4.0	1.1	25	3.8	4.0	1.0
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	13	4.5	5.0	0.8	11	4.5	5.0	0.8
Judge Leslie Dickson	29	4.5	5.0	0.8	27	4.5	5.0	0.8
Judge Michael Franciosi	35	4.6	5.0	0.7	33	4.7	5.0	0.6
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	38	4.8	5.0	0.5	36	4.8	5.0	0.4
Judge Michael Logue	23	4.1	4.0	1.0	21	4.1	4.0	1.0
Judge Kari L. McCrea	12	3.7	3.5	1.0	10	3.8	3.5	0.9
Judge David R. Wallace	41	4.6	5.0	0.8	38	4.6	5.0	0.8
Judge Pamela S. Washington	30	3.7	4.0	1.3	25	3.7	4.0	1.4
Judge Nathaniel Peters	12	3.8	4.0	1.0	11	3.9	4.0	1.0
Judge Matthew Christian	29	4.5	5.0	0.8	26	4.4	5.0	0.8
Judge William T. Montgomery	9	3.9	4.0	1.2	8	4.1	4.5	1.0

Table 5: Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating
Distribution of Responses for Overall Rating

	<i>n</i>	Poor		Deficient		Acceptable		Good		Excellent	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto	12	-	-	-	-	2	16.7	2	16.7	8	66.7
Judge Paul A. Roetman	14	-	-	-	-	1	7.1	2	14.3	11	78.6
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson	20	-	-	-	-	1	5.0	1	5.0	18	90.0
Judge Gregory Miller	10	-	-	1	10.0	-	-	5	50.0	4	40.0
Judge Christina Reigh	16	-	-	3	18.8	4	25.0	3	18.8	6	37.5
Judge Jennifer K. Wells	25	1	4.0	1	4.0	6	24.0	12	48.0	5	20.0
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman	11	-	-	-	-	2	18.2	1	9.1	8	72.7
Judge Leslie Dickson	27	-	-	-	-	4	14.8	5	18.5	18	66.7
Judge Michael Franciosi	33	-	-	-	-	2	6.1	7	21.2	24	72.7
Judge J. Patrick Hanley	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	16.7	30	83.3
Judge Michael Logue	21	-	-	2	9.5	3	14.3	7	33.3	9	42.9
Judge Kari L. McCrea	10	-	-	-	-	5	50.0	2	20.0	3	30.0
Judge David R. Wallace	38	1	2.6	-	-	2	5.3	8	21.1	27	71.1
Judge Pamela S. Washington	25	3	12.0	2	8.0	3	12.0	8	32.0	9	36.0
Judge Nathaniel Peters	11	-	-	1	9.1	3	27.3	3	27.3	4	36.4
Judge Matthew Christian	26	-	-	-	-	5	19.2	5	19.2	16	61.5
Judge William T. Montgomery	8	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	1	12.5	4	50.0

Note: Ratings from only those respondents with direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 6:
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	18	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	13	72.2
Professional reputation	3	16.7
Other personal contacts	2	11.1
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	11	84.6
Substantial amount of experience	5	38.5
Moderate amount of experience	3	23.1
Limited amount of experience	5	38.5

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 7:
Judge Romano D. DiBenedetto
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	18	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	13	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	11	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.4
Experience not within last 5 years	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.2	4.4
Moderate amount of experience	3	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	5	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Professional reputation	3	3.7	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 8:
Judge Paul A. Roetman
Description of Respondents' Experience

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	18	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	14	77.8
Professional reputation	4	22.2
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	11	84.6
Substantial amount of experience	4	28.6
Moderate amount of experience	8	57.1
Limited amount of experience	2	14.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 9:
Judge Paul A. Roetman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	18	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	14	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	11	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	8	4.4	4.3	4.6	4.5	4.5
Limited amount of experience	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	4	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 10:
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	22	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	21	95.5
Professional reputation	1	4.5
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	21	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	9.5
Moderate amount of experience	14	66.7
Limited amount of experience	5	23.8

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 11:
Judge Jennifer S. Henderson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	22	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.6	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	21	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.9
Experience within last 5 years	21	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	2	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	14	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.7	4.8
Limited amount of experience	5	4.8	5.0	4.4	4.4	4.8
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 12:
Judge Gregory Miller
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	12	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	10	83.3
Professional reputation	2	16.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	9	90.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	20.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	40.0
Limited amount of experience	4	40.0

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 13:
Judge Gregory Miller
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	12	3.8	4.1	4.2	3.8	4.0
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	10	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2
Experience within last 5 years	9	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.0	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	2	3.5	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.5
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.3
Limited amount of experience	4	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	2	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 14:
Judge Christina Reigh
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	17	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	16	94.1
Professional reputation	1	5.9
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	16	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	31.3
Moderate amount of experience	7	43.8
Limited amount of experience	4	25.0

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 15:
Judge Christina Reigh
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	17	3.3	3.9	4.1	3.9	3.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	16	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	16	3.4	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	3.4	3.6	4.4	4.4	3.6
Moderate amount of experience	7	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0
Limited amount of experience	4	2.8	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.5
Professional reputation	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 16:
Judge Jennifer K. Wells
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	29	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	25	86.2
Professional reputation	3	10.3
Other personal contacts	1	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	22	88.0
Substantial amount of experience	2	8.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	64.0
Limited amount of experience	7	28.0

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 17:
Judge Jennifer K. Wells
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	29	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	25	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	22	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	3	3.7	4.0	4.3	4.0	3.7
Substantial amount of experience	2	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.8
Limited amount of experience	7	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.6	3.6
Professional reputation	3	2.3	2.3	3.0	3.0	2.3
Other personal contacts	1	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 18:
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	13	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	11	84.6
Professional reputation	2	15.4
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	1	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	36.4
Moderate amount of experience	6	54.5
Limited amount of experience	1	9.1

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 19:
Judge Jonathan A. Woodman
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	13	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.5	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	11	4.5	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	10	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	5.0	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	6	4.2	4.5	4.2	4.2	4.2
Limited amount of experience	1	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Professional reputation	2	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 20:
Judge Leslie Dickson
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	30	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	28	93.3
Professional reputation	2	6.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	27	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	10.7
Moderate amount of experience	16	57.1
Limited amount of experience	9	32.1

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 21:
Judge Leslie Dickson
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	30	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	28	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience within last 5 years	27	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	9	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.2
Professional reputation	2	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 22:
Judge Michael Franciosi
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	36	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	34	94.4
Professional reputation	2	5.6
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	33	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	5	14.7
Moderate amount of experience	16	47.1
Limited amount of experience	13	38.2

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 23:
Judge Michael Franciosi
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	36	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	34	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience within last 5 years	33	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	5	4.6	4.6	4.8	4.8	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	16	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.7
Limited amount of experience	13	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.3	4.5
Professional reputation	2	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 24:
Judge J. Patrick Hanley
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	38	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	36	94.7
Professional reputation	2	5.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	33	94.3
Substantial amount of experience	9	25.0
Moderate amount of experience	19	52.8
Limited amount of experience	8	22.2

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 25:
Judge J. Patrick Hanley
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	38	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	36	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Experience within last 5 years	33	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
Experience not within last 5 years	2	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0
Substantial amount of experience	9	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.9	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.8
Limited amount of experience	8	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.6
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 26:
Judge Michael Logue
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	23	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	21	91.3
Professional reputation	2	8.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	20	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	19.0
Moderate amount of experience	7	33.3
Limited amount of experience	10	47.6

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 27:
Judge Michael Logue
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	23	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	21	4.1	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	20	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.2
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	4.5	4.8	4.5	4.8	4.5
Moderate amount of experience	7	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.6
Limited amount of experience	10	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.3
Professional reputation	2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 28:
Judge Kari L. McCrea
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	12	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	10	83.3
Professional reputation	2	16.7
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	10	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	4	40.0
Limited amount of experience	6	60.0

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 29:
Judge Kari L. McCrea
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	12	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	10	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.1	3.8
Experience within last 5 years	10	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.1	3.8
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	-	-	-	-	-	-
Moderate amount of experience	4	3.5	3.5	3.8	4.3	3.8
Limited amount of experience	6	3.8	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.8
Professional reputation	2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 30:
Judge David R. Wallace
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	41	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	38	92.7
Professional reputation	3	7.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	36	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	7	18.4
Moderate amount of experience	19	50.0
Limited amount of experience	12	31.6

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 31:
Judge David R. Wallace
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	41	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	38	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6
Experience within last 5 years	36	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.4	4.6
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	7	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.9	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	19	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.5	4.6
Limited amount of experience	12	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.3
Professional reputation	3	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.3
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 32:
Judge Pamela S. Washington
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	30	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	25	83.3
Professional reputation	4	13.3
Other personal contacts	1	3.3
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	3	12.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	36.0
Limited amount of experience	13	52.0

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 33:
Judge Pamela S. Washington
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	30	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	25	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7
Experience within last 5 years	24	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.0
Moderate amount of experience	9	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.4
Limited amount of experience	13	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.3
Professional reputation	4	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.5
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 34:
Judge Nathaniel Peters
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	12	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	11	91.7
Professional reputation	1	8.3
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	11	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	4	36.4
Moderate amount of experience	4	36.4
Limited amount of experience	3	27.3

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 35:
Judge Nathaniel Peters
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	12	3.8	3.8	4.1	3.9	3.8
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	11	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9
Experience within last 5 years	11	3.9	3.9	4.2	4.0	3.9
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.3	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3
Limited amount of experience	3	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0
Professional reputation	1	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 36:
Judge Matthew Christian
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	%
All respondents	29	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	26	89.7
Professional reputation	2	6.9
Other personal contacts	1	3.4
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	24	96.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	30.8
Moderate amount of experience	12	46.2
Limited amount of experience	6	23.1

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 37:
Judge Matthew Christian
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	29	4.4	4.8	4.6	4.4	4.5
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	26	4.3	4.8	4.5	4.3	4.4
Experience within last 5 years	24	4.4	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.5
Experience not within last 5 years	1	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
Substantial amount of experience	8	4.6	4.9	4.6	4.8	4.8
Moderate amount of experience	12	4.4	4.9	4.8	4.3	4.4
Limited amount of experience	6	3.8	4.3	3.8	3.7	4.0
Professional reputation	2	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Other personal contacts	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 38:
Judge William T. Montgomery
Description of Respondents' Experiences

	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents	9	100.0
Experience with Judge		
Direct professional experience	8	88.9
Professional reputation	1	11.1
Other personal contacts	-	-
Detailed Experience*		
Recent experience (within last 5 years)	8	100.0
Substantial amount of experience	1	12.5
Moderate amount of experience	4	50.0
Limited amount of experience	3	37.5

*Only among those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.

Table 39:
Judge William T. Montgomery
Detailed Responses

	<i>n</i>	Impartiality/ Fairness <i>M</i>	Integrity <i>M</i>	Judicial Temperament <i>M</i>	Diligence <i>M</i>	Overall <i>M</i>
All respondents	9	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.1	3.9
Basis for Evaluation						
Direct professional experience	8	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.1
Experience within last 5 years	8	4.3	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.1
Experience not within last 5 years	-	-	-	-	-	-
Substantial amount of experience	1	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0
Moderate amount of experience	4	4.5	4.3	4.5	4.5	4.3
Limited amount of experience	3	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.7
Professional reputation	1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Other personal contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Ratings from only those respondents reporting direct professional experience with the judge.